22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
8							
9							
10	COURTNEY ANDERSON, et al.,	No. C 12-06386 WHA					
11	Plaintiffs,						
12	v.						
13	NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE, et al.,						
14	Defendants.						
15	AARON SCHOBEL, et al.	No. C 12-06415 WHA					
16	Plaintiffs,						
17		ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THE CASES SHOULD NOT					
18	v. NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE, <i>et al.</i> ,	BE CONSOLIDATED					
19							
20	Defendants/						
21							

By order dated February 22, the above-captioned actions were related and assigned to the undersigned judge. Plaintiffs in both actions are former National Football League players who filed suit to vacate an arbitration award in favor of defendants National Football League Management Council, Buffalo Bills, Denver Broncos, New York Giants and Philadelphia Eagles. The parties participated in a consolidated arbitration before Arbitrator Michael Beck, who issued one award on December 12, 2012. Defendants have filed a motion to consolidate the two actions for all purposes pursuant to Rule 42(a). The two complaints were filed on the same day and appear to be nearly identical copies of each other, albeit brought by different plaintiffs.

Defendants as	sert that plaintiffs	do not oppose	consolidation,	but have not	submitted any
evidence in su	pport of this stater	nent.			

Given the similarity of the two complaints, the Court is inclined to grant defendants' motion for consolidation for all purposes. Plaintiffs are hereby ordered to respond to the motion stating whether or not they oppose consolidation and, if they oppose, their reasons therefor. Plaintiffs' response(s) are due by FEBRUARY 27 AT NOON.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 25, 2013.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE